United States District Court, Northern District of Illinois

Name of Assigned Judge or Magistrate Judge		Philip G. Reinhard	Sitting Judge if Other than Assigned Judge			
CASE NUMBER		04 CR 50024	DATE	8/26/	2004	
CASE TITLE		United States vs. Breit				
MOTIO	N:	[In the following box (a) indicate the party filing of the motion being presented.]	The second secon			
Control of the contro						
DOCKET ENTRY:						
(1)	(1) Filed motion of [use listing in "Motion" box above.]					
(2)	☐ Brief	Brief in support of motion due				
(3)	☐ Answer brief to motion due Reply to answer brief due					
(4)	□ Rulin	aling/Hearing on set for at				
(5)	☐ Status	Status hearing[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at				
(6)		Pretrial conference[held/continued to] [set for/re-set for] on set for at				
(7)	☐ Trial[set for/re-set for] on at					
(8)						
(9)	☐ This o	This case is dismissed [with/without] prejudice and without costs[by/agreement/pursuant to] ☐ FRCP4(m) ☐ Local Rule 41.1 ☐ FRCP41(a)(1) ☐ FRCP41(a)(2).				
(10) Other docket entry] For the reasons stated on the reverse memorandum opinion and order,						
defendant's motion for a bill of particulars is denied.						
Maple. Lencel						
[For further detail see order on the reverse side of the original minute order.]						
	notices required, notices required.	advised in open court.			Document Number	
	tices mailed by ju-	lge's staff		number of notices		
	tified counsel by t		Al	$JG_{2_{\text{date dockered}}}^{72004}$	_ '.	
Doc	cketing to mail no	tices.		MIL	56	
├ ──┤	il AO 450 form.	TAU09)	n Sinishigus n	docketing deputy initials		
Cop	py to judge/magis	1		8-27-0): 	
	LC	courtroom deputy's	CO IN HIS SE SHIP WIND			
		initials Date/tin	ne received in Clerk's Office	mailing deputy initials		

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Defendant, Michael Breit, filed a motion for a bill of particulars as to both Counts I and II of the indictment. Defendant contends the allegations in Count I are insufficient because they do not specify the precise date or dates upon which defendant allegedly received explosive materials. As for Count II, defendant reiterates his contention concerning the lack of specific dates and also maintains that Count II is deficient for failing to specify the particular victims or property related to the charged offense. Based on these purported deficiencies, defendant seeks a bill of particulars.

Rule 7(f) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure allows for a bill of particulars, that is, a more specific expression of the illegal activities a defendant is accused of having engaged in. <u>United States v. Canino</u>, 949 F. 2d 928, 948 (7th Cir. 2001). The decision whether to require a bill of particulars is discretionary, and the standard is whether the indictment sufficiently apprises the defendant of the charge to enable him to prepare for trial. <u>Canino</u>, 949 F. 2d at 948. A bill of particulars is not required where information necessary for a defense can be obtained through some other satisfactory form such as an openfile policy. <u>Canino</u>, 949 F. 2d at 948. Finally, while a motion for a bill of particulars must be filed no later than 10 days after arraignment, the court may permit such a motion to be filed at a later time. Fed. R. Crim. P. 7(f).

In this case, the court will allow the untimely motion for a bill of particulars to be filed. The motion is denied, however, as the allegations of the indictment, combined with the government's openfile policy, sufficiently allow defendant to prepare for trial.